

REMARKS

Entry of Amendment

As Applicant is filing a RCE herewith, this amendment should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 3-9, 11-13 and 21-25 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner states that the limitation in Claims 3 and 6 of "wherein the active layer and the gate interconnection are formed over the same insulating plane with the gate insulating film interposed between the active layer and the gate interconnection" is not described in the specification or shown in the figure.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending Claims 3 and 6 to recite "a gate electrode" and "wherein the active layer and the gate electrode are formed over the same insulating plane with the gate insulating film interposed between the active layer and the gate electrode, in a third region." This amendment is clearly supported by Fig. 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, Claims 3-9, 11-13 and 21-25 are clearly supported by the written description of the present application, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

The Examiner further rejects Claims 1-6 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by “Applicant Admitted Prior Art (fig. 7, pages 2-3)”. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner states that Fig. 7 and pages 2-3 in “Applicant Admitted Prior Art” show “wherein the gate interconnection (705) and the source interconnection (707) are formed on a same insulating plane (701), in a first region.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In particular, Fig. 7 does not show source interconnection 707 on same insulating plane 701. Instead, source interconnection 707 is on semiconductor layer 702. Hence, Fig. 7 does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature of independent Claims 1-3 and 6.

Further, while Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claims 1-3 and 6 to recite “wherein the gate interconnection and the source interconnection are formed on and in direct contact with a same insulating plane, in a first region.” This feature is shown, for example, in Fig. 1 of the present application.

In contrast, Fig. 7 of “Applicant Admitted Prior Art” clearly does not show source interconnection 707 on and in direct contact with a same insulating plane 701. Instead, as explained above, source interconnection 707 is on semiconductor layer 702.

Therefore, independent Claims 1-3 and 6 are not disclosed or suggested by “Applicant Admitted Prior Art,” and Claims 1-6 are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 8-11 and 21-25

The Examiner rejects Claims 8-11 and 21-25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applicant Admitted Prior Art.” This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

Each of these claims is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, each of these claims is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 12

The Examiner also rejects Claim 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applicant Admitted Prior Art” in view of Nakajima (US 6,420,758). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 13

The Examiner also rejects Claim 13 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applicant Admitted Prior Art” in view of Matsuura et al. (US 7,034,339). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment and/or RCE, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: January 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568